

# SOUTHERN STANDARD.

VOLUME I.

COLUMBUS, LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1851.

NUMBER 12.

## SOUTHERN STANDARD

IS ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY  
CHAPMAN & SMITH,  
At three dollars per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS.—First insertion (ten lines or less) \$1.00; for each subsequent insertion, 50 cents. The number of insertions must be specified on the face of the copy furnished, or it will be published until for and charged as above.

All articles of a personal character will be charged double the above rates—*and in advance when admitted.*

Political circulars or public addresses for the benefit of individuals will be charged as advertisements. On yearly advertisements, a liberal discount will be made. The privilege of yearly advertisements will be limited to their own immediate business; advertisements sent in by them embracing other matter, will be charged for by the square.

67—Letters on business connected with the office must be post paid to insure attention.

From the Democratic Review.

### The Philosophy of the American Union: OR, THE PRINCIPLES OF ITS COHESIVENESS.

#### THE ELEMENTS OF DISUNION.

Whom God hath united let no man separate, is an injunction applied to man and woman in matrimony, and is founded on the correlative organization of the wedded couple. God has created each of the parties incomplete without the other, and ended each with organs, desires, intellectual tendencies and physical powers subsidiary to the social cohesiveness of the two. The same injunction is occasionally applied fondly to the political union of the sovereign States in our national confederacy; but we shall speak more profitably, in times like the present, if we examine less poetically the characteristics of our federal nationality, which instead of being a union that nature dictated, is a result of consummate art to unite those whom God separated, making some of them powerful and others feeble, scattering them also apart with vast intervening distances; diversifying them with great differences of climate, natural productions, social habits, industrial pursuits and capabilities, so that even a uniform tariff of imposts, which should be compatible with the prosperity of all the States, is constantly a result of elaborately adjusted compromises between the antagonistic interests of the respective confederates. So violent were these antagonisms brought into conflict in the year 1832, by a tariff that was deemed too favorable to protection, and consequently too aggressive to the non-manufacturing States who were only consumers, that South Carolina organized a system of resistance to its collection; though a tariff is the most indispensable want of the general government, and to insure its uniformity in all the States, was one of the principal motives for the formation of the Union. So the long embargo that occurred during the presidency of Jefferson, and the long commercial non-intercourse with foreign countries, and subsequent war during the presidency of Madison, were results of some of the most indispensable functions of every government; but they affected our States so differently, that while some prospered thereunder, others were so injured, that a Convention was assembled at Hartford to give organization and efficiency to the dissatisfied, with a view to the coercive termination of their grievances.

The foregoing elements of disunion are inveterated by the constituent formation of our national legislature. In the French chambers the members are all Frenchmen; but our members of Congress are effectively Georgians, New-Yorkers, Carolinians, Pennsylvanians, &c., every member being identified by interest and by rival attachments with the State he represents, and to whom partially he owes his station and ordinarily his hopes of future advancement; hence the importance which is attached by the States respectively to the admission of new States into the Union, as influencing the balance of power in Congress between the geographical divisions of the confederacy. The practical effect of this want of homogeneity in our legislature is seen in the hostility which existed to the purchase of Louisiana and Florida, to the acquisition of Texas, to the progress of our victories in Mexico, and in our church reception, by treaty, of California and New Mexico.

The elements of disunion which we thus exemplify rather than enumerate, are not an unexpected ingredient in our confederacy. They manifested themselves in the convention that formed our national Constitution, and constituted an obstacle which seemed for a long time insurmountable, and which was ultimately overcome by only numerous compromises. "To draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which may be preserved, is at all times difficult," said the convention; "and on the present occasion this difficulty," say they, "was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and peculiar interests. The Constitution which we now present is the result of amity, and of that natural deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable. That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State is not, perhaps, to be expected; but each will doubtless consider, that had her interests alone been consulted, the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others."

"By the unanimous order of the Convention," "GEORGE WASHINGTON, President," "The most efficacious compromise in forming the general government was a limitation of its powers. When we speak of the compromises of the Constitution, we are prone to regard only the provisions that relate to domestic slavery. These compromises proceeded from the clashing interests of the several States; but the most important compromise is referred to in the above address of General Washington, where he speaks of 'drawing with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which may be preserved.' This compromise consisted in reconciling the clashing interests of the federal sovereignty that was to be created, and the State's sovereignty that was to be retained. The reconciliation was eventually perfected by limiting the action of the general government to a small number of expressed objects. The States had recently emerged from a contest with Great Britain, whose monarch had, by a definitive treaty, ceded his undoubted sovereignty not to the United States as a whole, but to each State severally and by name; hence the States went into the constitutional convention as independent sovereigns. They severally determined to make no surrenders of power not dictated by their respective interests; and they left the convention in the belief that they retained all the sovereignty they had not specifically surrendered. We may well admire the elaborate precautions that were taken in the constitution to render this belief apparent and secure; but to make the restriction as definite as language can make it, the Congress that assembled under the new constitution, (March 4th, 1789) added thereto an amendment, which was subsequently

duly ratified, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The amendment grew out of a desire therefore by several States, expressed when they originally acceded to the constitution; and for the avowed object of "preventing misconception or abuse of power."

The cohesiveness of the confederacy, and the circumscription of its powers, are made by nature measures of each other.

When France adopted recently universal suffrage as the basis of her republic, Lamartine remarked in its favor, that it was the strongest basis which any government could adopt, by reason that all occasions for revolution were extinguished, when a people can at all times legally adopt public measures to their own will. By like principles a confederacy in which each confederate can regulate her own interests, must be the most cohesive of all associations—no occasion for disunion being possible. But a liberty so extensive would render impossible any efficient general action; hence the framers of our constitution approximated to this extreme liberty, as far as practicable, by leaving to the respective States all their sovereignty, except in a few particulars, whose surrender was deemed desirable to each and all. Indeed, no mathematical proposition can be more certain, than that we diminish the causes of disunion, in proportion as we circumscribe the number of occasions in which the action of the general government can legally conflict with any local special interest. The converse of this rule is equally true, and if our States should unanimously alter the constitution, giving unlimited sovereignty to the general government, our local interests, habits and pursuits are so conflicting, that the Union would soon break into fragments, as all former large empires have broken, whose cohesion has been military force—a cohesion which alone holds together antagonistic interests that a single legislature attempts to subject to procrustean laws.

The construction of our confederacy is wiser than its framers.

The preservative virtue which, as shown above, is innate in the limited powers of our general government, was not foreseen by the framers of our National Constitution, wise and patriotic as we delight to deem them. The limitations originated in the accidental division of our country into separate colonies, with separate legislative organizations, and other concomitants of distinct sovereignties. Had our people been united under one government before our separation from Great Britain, the whole, after the attainment of independence, would doubtless have continued united under some single organization; notwithstanding the lesson of all history that large consolidated governments, whether monarchical or republican, contain alike the elements of dissolution. Happily, therefore, for us, when our ancestors convened to "form a more perfect union," the discordant interests of our extensive country were already grouped into separate State sovereignties, and could be united under one federal whole only by continuing measurably distinct. Our national government commenced, therefore in a separation, just where a consolidated national government would have violently terminated, after some years of smouldering rebellion. The wisdom of no man could have originated the conception of a government limited like ours, and we are yet to learn whether man possesses wisdom enough to endure its restraints. To err in this particular is most easy, for while the motive for limitations can be seen only by laborious examination, the motives for disregarding their spirit, if not their letter, are as apparent to every member of Congress, and partisan orator, as the blessings which he sees deducible from any measure that will minister to his prejudices, interests or self-conceit.

The limitations of our Constitution are as favorable to personal liberty as to the duration of our confederacy.

Notwithstanding the world has gazed at our political system for more than sixty years, the vulgar principle of forcibly subjecting one locality to the interests and notions of another, is the only kind of aggregative nationality that is yet practiced in Europe; hence the first use which France made of its lately acquired republicanism was to impose the philanthropy of France on its West India colonies, by abolishing therein domestic slavery, irrespective wholly of the wishes and interests of the colonists, who were thus summarily deprived of their property without any compensation, and with other people's consciences and property, though probably consummated in defiance to liberty, is repugnant to the more pervading liberty which results from permitting every community to regulate its own domestic policy—a liberty which is as precious to a small community as to a larger, and which is only surrendered by any, from physical necessity.

The principle of interference by one community with the local concerns of another, is, however, never limited to domestic slavery. It is practised towards the religious prejudices of Ireland, who evince constant uneasiness to be disconnected from England. The principle of interference, wherever established, obeys no limit, but the sufferance of its victims; hence the repeated insurrections of Poland to be severed from Russia, and the late sanguinary struggle of Hungary to be independent of Austria. The sad results of interference contrast now with the conduct of Texas, voluntarily relinquishing her distinct nationality, and in the language of a great man, "fighting her way into the Union." And look at California when lately the steamship Oregon was described in the bay of San Francisco, and by the continued booming of her cannon, gave note that she brought great news. Soon multitudes of joyfully-expectant people rushed to the beach, and from every pinnacle floated suddenly the "stars and stripes;" for California was admitted into the Union. But let no man be so superficial as to suppose, that the bells which were pealed on that occasion, the bonfires which lighted every hill, the public meetings for congratulation, and the general enthusiasm, were produced by considerations that California had become connected with a powerful sovereignty. The enthusiasm arose from a consciousness that California had herself become sovereign, with only so much subjugation to the general government as California believed was for her advantage.

The limitations of the Constitution depend more on their construction than on their letter.

Having shown that the limitations of the Constitution are as favorable to the most extensive liberty, as to the longest duration of our confederacy, we gain but little, because the efficiency of the limitations will depend on the rules of construction which we apply to them. This is discoverable in the diversity of opinions which at different times have prevailed on the constitutionality of a national bank, and in numerous other constitutional conflicts of opinion which have filled volumes of law reports. Captiousness is not the origin of the disagreements, but an inherent diversity of men's feelings, interests, knowledge and acuteness; hence the principles which are to be used in construing constitutional limitations, are of more practical importance than the words in

which the limitations are expressed.

#### LOOSE CONSTRUCTION.

But all constructions of any instrument are governed by the objects which the construer thinks the instrument was designed to subserve; hence every remedial statute is construed liberally by judges, that the intended remedy may be made effectual. But when a statute imposes a penalty, it is construed strictly, that the intended injury may not be inflicted, if the language of the statute can afford a reasonable doubt of its applicability.

A politician, therefore, who views the limitations of the Constitution as a remedy against the dissolution of the confederacy—(and hence as the only means whereby any political good can be permanently accomplished by the confederacy,) will be a strict constructionist of the powers of the Constitution. But the politician who looks superficially at the limitations, deeming them only unreasonable obstructions of the power "to promote the general welfare," will deem the limitations as penalties, to be inflicted only where they must; and he will be a loose constructionist of the powers of the Constitution. John Quincy Adams, who was an open and fearless proponent of a loose construction, as he was of all opinions which he honestly entertained, said, in his first presidential message to Congress, "while dwelling with pleasing satisfaction upon the superior excellence of our political institutions, let us not be unmindful that liberty is power; that the nation, blessed with the largest portion of liberty, must, in proportion to its numbers, be the most powerful nation upon earth; and that the tenure of power by man, is, in the moral purposes of his Creator, upon condition that it shall be exercised to the ends of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow-men. While foreign nations, less blessed than ourselves with that freedom which is power, are advancing with gigantic strides in the career of public improvement; were we to slumber in indolence, or fold up our arms and proclaim to the world that we are pained by the will of our constituents, would it not be to cast away the bounties of Providence, and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority?"

All this is thus so well and patriotically stated by Mr. Adams is true, but it is totally inapplicable to our confederacy, who are a nation for only a limited number of purposes, and can continue a nation only by adhering strictly to the limitations; as we may be assured by the present agitations, as well as by several preceding ones which brought the confederacy to the verge of dissolution. The power to which Mr. Adams alludes exists in our States respectively, and their people, who, instead of 'slumbering in indolence and folding their arms,' have advanced in the career of public improvement, canals, rail-roads, plank-roads, electric telegraphs, steamboat navigation, steamship construction, public education, and all the other elements of progress, to a degree which no other people ever witnessed; and to a degree which the national government could not have attained had it been legally invested with the attributes of unrestricted sovereignty.

Our only alternative is strict construction or dissolution.

Seeing then that the loosest construction which can be imagined will not promote good objects so effectively as the strictest construction, we need not regret, that by the laws of nature we possess no alternative but to be content with the good which the general government can effect within the sphere of its most restricted powers, or to weaken the bonds of our Union. Recent events show that these views are more than theoretical, and they have painfully forced on the perception of the most obtuse intellect, that the loose construction by which Congress claims the power to circumscribe domestic slavery in the Territories, interferes so sensitively with our Southern confederates as to immediately endanger the Union.

Now in relation to the right of a State to secede from the Union, or to redress injuries to her sovereignty by any other means in her power, the right is not constitutional, any more than our original revolution was loyal, or that our war of 1812 was conformable to the definitive treaty made with Great Britain in 1783, and which stipulated for a "perpetual peace." The right of secession is nevertheless perfect, being one of the "inalienable rights" referred to in the Declaration of Independence; and with which it says, we are endowed by our Creator. Enumerated among these are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" and "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government."

We all feel that secession is practicable, and to urge a discontinuance of further annoyances against the South, we have lately seen numerous attempts at "Union Meetings" in our large commercial cities, and their influence will be salutary; but the parties seem not to have probed to the bottom of the difficulty. Indeed, the superficial views which these meetings take of the difficulty of our position, is painfully indicative that the nature of our confederacy is too little understood by its friends. They see our present danger, and are desirous of averting it; but they seem moved thereto more by fear of consequences than conviction of error, in the principle from which the danger has arisen. They cry aloud for Union, and some would fight for it, but these are not the way (especially the latter) of obtaining it; and humanity may rejoice that it is not. But especially they seem not to know that slavery agitation is only the symptom of a disease, not the disease itself.

The disease is a loose construction of the Constitution, and the remedy is a strict construction.—Slavery is only the symptom of to-day, as a protective tariff was the symptom of 1832, and as a great system of internal improvements by the general government may be to-morrow. The friends of Union, therefore, should understand that they must be strict constructionists of the Constitution, if they would be Union-men in an intelligent, pervading, and enduring sense.

Wholesome restriction exceeds the conventional restrictions.

Nor need we fear that the strictest construction to which we can subject the constitution, will be prejudicial. Our dangers lie not thitherward.—The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia is constitutionally within the power of Congress, as was the abolition therein of the slave trade; but who knows not that this legislation is distasteful to the South, and thus conflicts in spirit with the constitutional restrictions which enable the confederacy to hold together? When, also, some years ago, the proceeds of the public lands were distributed among the States in the most equitable manner, to the great relief of some States, and to the support of education in others, yet it was offensive to some of the agricultural States, though certainly constitutional. They saw that the money which was thus diverted from the federal treasury would necessarily be supplied by an enhanced tariff; and that the non-manufacturing States would thus be taxed to the benefit of the manufacturing States, as effectually, as though the tariff had been enhanced for the express purpose of protection.

The most efficient preservative principle is the danger of aggression.

But after enlightening ourselves fully on the preservative qualities of a strict construction of the constitution, how can we insure its application in national legislation? A present good has ever preponderated over a prospective evil. The strong have ever tyrannized over the weaker, to the extent that aggression was met by sufferance. Aggression, therefore, can only be arrested by resistance. Nor is the remedy speculative merely.—When Missouri, in 1820, was refused admission into the Union, by reason that the constitution framed by her inhabitants permitted domestic slavery, nothing prevented the consummation of the aggression but unmistakable demonstrations that it would effect a dissolution of the confederacy.—So the resistance, in 1832, of South Carolina, to a protective tariff, was mainly effectual in the subsequent abandonment of the principle; till now, the most which is claimed by the opponents of free trade, is an incidental protection, after the expenditures of the government shall be reduced, as much as practicable, by economy and the land money. But to admit old examples, what caused the abandonment, at the last session of Congress, of the Wilmot proviso, though patriotism during the war with Mexico, and our armies there in imminent peril for reinforcements, in vain could cause it to be abandoned? And what caused the efficient amendment of the fugitive slave law, the nullification of which for many long years, had been the labored effort of States, and the favorite amusement of associated societies? and what arouses in nearly all our large cities, Union meetings, without distinction of party, to arrest slavery agitation, on which parties so long have lived? It is the determined spirit evinced by some of the aggrieved States, that they will no longer submit to what outrages their interests and their feelings.

Let not the truly Union men, therefore, look with disapprobation at the agitation which is pervading the South, for it is but the tempest which is to purify the political atmosphere; and by a means which God has ordained for the purposes of longevity. Nations and society of every grade are kept peaceable and just by only the antagonisms which nature arouses between the aggrieved and the aggressor. Sufferance, on the contrary, but facilitates further aggression; and unrestricted submission in the intercourse of mankind with each other, would be attended with universal ravage, rapine and outrage. Thus, had the slave States tamely submitted to the imposition of the Wilmot proviso to New Mexico and Utah, we should, instead of Union meetings to arrest further agitation, have had meetings every where to spirit forward the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and our confederacy, "sore in its pride of place," would have been continually thus "hawked at by every mouning owl," till it would have lost all its preservative elements, and become practically a huge consolidation, which the diversity of exasperated local interests, and geographical hatreds, would, eventually, have broken into irreparable fragments.

For the aggrieved to resist aggression is, therefore, the most patriotic of duties; and the fault of the South consists in not having resisted effectually in 1820, instead of compromising by the circumscription of slavery in Missouri. If an injured party is subdued by force, he must submit; but he who submits without physical necessity is an accessory to his own dishonor; and in our confederacy he becomes an accomplice in the overthrow of the Union.

All the concessions of the South have been rendered without an equivalent.

Nor need we be surprised that the South is not quieted by the late compromise measures. Who sees not that the Californians formed their constitution under the coercion of knowing that admission into the Union was impracticable, except by a prohibition of slavery; and that an extension of the interdiction over nearly all the territory acquired from Mexico, would facilitate the admission. To say that the new fugitive slave law is an equivalent for this aggression, is to aggravate the injury by taking advantage of our own wrong; for the new law is beneficial to the South only because we practically nullified the old. The like may be said of our abandonment of the Wilmot proviso in the organization of New Mexico and Utah, an abandonment that was useful to the South by reason only of our wrong in meditating the restriction.

In short, every compromise the South has entered into has resulted in a sacrifice without an available equivalent. Capitulation and other direct taxation was, by the constitution, to be apportioned among the States according to the ratio of their representation; hence, rather than be taxed for the whole number of their slaves, the South consented that every five slaves should be counted as only three persons. But no direct taxation is levied, and the loss of representation by the South is without an equivalent; aggravated, too, by the fact that every five slaves who escape to the North without being recaptured, will be represented in Congress as five persons; though the blacks are usually as much debarré from the right of suffrage in the North as in the South.

The remedy which alone can restore fraternal harmony.

The people, like other sovereigns, are so little accustomed to hear truth, that the foregoing remarks may seem strange; but the time is arrived when the whole truth should be told, that our citizens, never acting intentionally wrong, may know what is due to their virtue and patriotism.—They will not learn it from partisan leaders, who, in speaking of even the late compromise measures, seem more intent on apologizing for abandoning the Wilmot Proviso, (some law of God having superseded it, they say,) than by wholesomely inculcating the usurpation of its infliction. To thus doubt the patriotism and wisdom of the people is an old error, and will not medicate the wounds we have inflicted in fraternal bosoms.—In vain, also, are our protestations of love for the Union, unless we show our love more effectively than by declarations—and be assured, that a forbearance toward lawlessly fled slaves, with a President said to be determined to enforce them, is not all that is required by love for the Union; nor is mere abstinence from further aggression—little more remaining for further aggression to accomplish. If our Union demonstrations are something more than a temporary bending to the whirlwind of our own raising, we must make restitution to the South, by a division of California at the latitude of 36° 30'; some ten millions of dollars will be given for which, will bless California, and regain the friendship of the South.

THE CONCLUSION.

Politicians who excite each other in Congressional debate, are prone to mistake for public feeling what is only an effect of their own position.—The people of the North cared nothing last winter what terms of compromise should be concocted, so long as the terms would restore peace; and they care nothing now for the respective measures, except as they shall prove effectual towards harmony. In truth, the North had, last winter, no surrenders to make, but a relinquishment of their

own unwarrantable interference with the domestic relations of other men, as free as themselves, and as capable of self-government. If these views impute too much good sense to the North, and especially if we are not prepared for such a reversal of our conduct as is urged in the foregoing leaves, we are not equal to the exigency of the times, or to live under a confederate government such as no preceding people ever enjoyed. The South, even now, show a placability (as they have during our whole period of encroachments) which nothing can cause but a great love for the Union. We may, therefore, under a persistence in our errors, enjoy a truce for a season—but no enduring union. With the restoratives herein recommended, and a strict construction of the constitution in all future legislation, we may safely expect long years of internal tranquility. Geographical divisions, which constitute "the madness of the many for the gain of a few," will fade away. No causes will exist for rejecting non-confederates, by local jealousies in regard to the balance of sectional strength; and we may diffuse the blessings of our system limitlessly, Canada-ward or Mexico-ward, to the advantage of ourselves, and the happiness of others. In the language, therefore, of inspiration, (and no language is too sacred,) placed before you this day are good and evil. Choose ye!

#### Virginia and South Carolina.

In another place will be found, copied from the Richmond Enquirer, a series of resolutions, elaborately studied out by a Special Committee of thirteen worthy, and adopted almost unanimously by the House of Delegates, on Tuesday last. The Senate have not yet acted upon them, but we judge from the vote of the House that they must pass, and that they are consequently to be considered as the "voice of Virginia,"—and what a voice it is!—what a faint hearted whine, to replace the trumpet note that used to speak from the lips of the Great Commonwealth!

We have observed for some time past, in the Richmond papers, and the Washington Union, the symptoms and preparations of this appeal of Virginia to South Carolina, against State action.—Their articles on this subject have been very much commended by Northern presses, and no doubt deserved all the praise they have received from that quarter. Part of the design, as indicated by these newspapers, is that Virginia should depute one or more "sufficient men" to come boldly to South Carolina, and use their most strenuous industry to prevent her from running off the track. They fortify this suggestion by a former instance. When South Carolina they say, was on the verge of collision with the General Government in 1832, Virginia interposed with her friendly advice and good offices, and sent one of her distinguished citizens to South Carolina, as a peace maker. The result was that South Carolina was delivered out of the lion's jaws, and the Union was saved! Such is the account which these venacious and interesting chroniclers give, of the settlement of the nullification struggle. We remember very well the mission of WATKINS LEIGH, and that he was kindly received, and that the purpose of his visit was considered as respectable as his personal character was estimable. We have always understood that his representations were listened to with entire courtesy, but we never before heard it hinted that his mission had any more weight in the settlement of the controversy, than the mission of Mr. Hugh S. Legare to Belgium, which took place about the same time. This action of Virginia was taken as a proof of respectful sympathy on the part of the sister State, and as such was responded to with the most cordiality.

But inasmuch as neither the ambassador nor the State that commissioned him, professed to have any power to treat on the question involved, and inasmuch as South Carolina passed the Ordinance of Nullification and Congress met it by the Compromise of '33' because they did not dare to meet it by armies and navies,—it is really a most unaccountable pretension this, that Virginia settled that controversy by sending Mr. Watkins Leigh to South Carolina, with a bundle of advice, not a scrap of which was ever used.

But we desire not to undervalue the attentions of Virginia—far from it. If she shall decide to send a deputation of her citizens to present her remonstrances and her opinion to the Legislature or the Convention of this State, we feel assured they will meet a kindly welcome and a respectful audience. We think, indeed, we are justified in promising, that the attention will be reciprocated, and that some trustworthy citizen of Carolina will be sent to Richmond, provided with copies of former resolves and solemn pledges of Virginia, (which this State has done no more than copy and follow up,) and commissioned to invite and urge her to resume her office of leader of the South, and return to that position, whence alike her honor and her safety mourn her absence.

Certainly the Carolina representative would have much the most inspiring office. His work would be to win over a powerful ally to a noble and a sacred cause—the cause of organized liberty, against the attacks of reckless agrarianism. What, on the other hand, will the Virginian say to us? Will he urge that Virginia has disowned her principles, dishonored her pledges, and slunk away from a contest of which she was the first to mark the impassable boundaries,—and that, therefore, it is proper that as Carolina followed her lead to the battle-field she should also follow the same leader in abandoning the batteries and deserting the standards?

Will he take these latest Legislative resolves, and expound them for our edification and correction! It will call for an ingenious man to extract much matter from them. The most serious proposition contained in them is, in effect, that the secession of South Carolina would be dangerous to the integrity of the Union! and the only practical measure broached, is the instruction to the Governor to send a copy of the resolves to every State except Vermont. So we have here a new Virginia platform, made up of the profound deduction, that secession is unfavorable to the integrity of the Union, and of the comprehensive remedial measure of cutting the acquaintance of Vermont, and there is to be an embassy to South Carolina to set forth these immensely important matters.

Charleston Mercury.

IN THE FIELD.—The following letter from General Winfield Scott was addressed to the Whig Committee of Mifflin county, in Penn., in answer to a series of resolutions adopted by them recommending him as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States:

WASHINGTON, March 12.  
DEAR SIR: The Whig Committee and the Secretary of Juniata county, Pennsylvania, have done me great honor.

The approbation of my countrymen was the first and will be the last great object of my life. If I have the happiness to obtain that, it will be of minor importance whether it leads to a change in my official position or not.

With my most respectful regard to the gentlemen of the committee, I remain, my dear sir, yours truly,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

A. K. McCLELLAN, Esq.

THE BITTER BIT.—A New York correspondent of the Pennsylvania relates the following.

"The bitter does sometimes get bit. Abolitionism sometimes gets humbugged; but never so beautifully as in a case which came to my knowledge to-day. During the great excitement of the fugitive slave law, at the east, a leading vagabond of a negro; who has been a well known dock loafer about our docks for some years past, took a journey to Union Village, in this State, on some business connected with the do-nothing society, of which Sambo is a most industrious member. The Abolitionists there asked him if he was a fugitive slave? Cuffee, to carry out the joke, (for the fellow is a practical joker,) replied in the affirmative, whereupon they treated him very kindly, raised money for him, gave him good dinners, some very excellent clothing, and, with letters from brother this to somebody that sent him on his way from town to town, everywhere receiving the same attention as at Union Village.

"At last, having reached Whitehall, Sambo thought he would come back to New York, and resume his dock loafing again, having made money and comfortable enough in the fugitive slave 'business' to make him tolerably independent during the winter. He tells the story of his adventures with great gusto, and particularly the distinguished attentions paid him by the 'big folks.' He spent several days at the house of ex-Governor Slade, of Vermont. He advises his fellow-loafers, and the blacks generally, to go into 'do business, and make 'em fortune.' The cream of the joke in this case is to be found in the fact that the fellow was never south of Mason and Dixon's line in his life! He was born at Saratoga, in this State, in 1820, lived a while in Pennsylvania, and lately in this city, but never in a slave State. The 'documents' given him by some of the Abolition gentlemen he fell in with, are exceedingly rich."

Some of the submission prints are rejoicing in anticipation of the downfall of the Southern Press.—We hear no such rejoicing anticipations in reference to the "National Era," the abolition organ of the same city. In nothing does Southern submission so exhibit its treason to home and its deep depravity, as in the expression of its fierce hatred to those whose crime is, devotion to the Rights of the South. They can forgive any thing but Southern patriotism. Strange mystery! If the South falls she will fall by the pariah hands of her own sons. Such will be the verdict of the grand inquest of history, when in future ages, the rise and fall of her institutions is written. It will be recorded that with all the elements of a successful defence, with power and resources boundless and unrivaled, the South became fello de se.—Columbus Enquirer.

#### Seward Endorsing Fillmore.

The members of New York Legislature have lately been on a visit to New York City. While there they were entertained in fine style at the Astor House, by the City Council—the notorious Wm. H. Seward being among the guests. His speech leaves no doubt of the act already announced through the press, that whatever may have been the feelings, in months passed, on the part of the President and the New York Senator towards each other, they are now of the kindest character. Mr. Seward thus speaks of President Fillmore:

"Hon. Wm. H. Seward, on being called upon spoke as follows: Gentlemen—Legislators of the City of New York, and Legislators of the State of New York—I perform a cheerful duty in rising, as it seems to me to be your wish, to respond to the sentiment in which you have expressed your confidence in regard to the Executive and the Legislature of the United States of America. It is not presumptions in me to say, on behalf of the illustrious citizen who fills the chair of the Chief Magistracy of the United States—the native citizen of New York, the second one who has filled that distinguished place—that his sentiments are what they ought to be—just and impartial to all the members of this confederacy; and yet, that the sun which he worships most, and which he will worship last, is that which he gazed on in his earliest hours—the sun of the State of New York."

Of course then, with the testimony of Mr. Seward that Fillmore's "sentiments are what they ought to be," the South can no longer distrust or doubt him. The bond of indemnity against any infringement of her rights, which is tendered to the South, stands thus: MILLARD FILLMORE, Principal, WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Security. Who but the veriest fire-eater, can object to the sufficiency of the instrument?—Nashville American.

THE SOUTHERN PATRIOT.—There is something very remarkable—at least very novel—in the mode of conducting and circulating this new paper published at Greenville.

We have been informed by several gentlemen residing in different parts of our district, that large packages of the Patriot are sent regularly to the several post offices, directed to individuals in some instances, and in others sent for distribution, with the assurance, by a responsible man living in Greenville, that the paper will be sent to any person free for three months, and not to be paid for at all but at the pleasure of the readers. Now, if the proprietors of that paper can afford to give it away, (and in this way make an issue of 2,000 copies,) we have no right to complain. But we have a right to make our own inference. Such a paper cannot be published, issuing 2,000 copies weekly, without a very considerable expenditure of money. If the proprietors thus give away their own money, they certainly deserve credit for enlarged liberality and unusual benevolence. If, however, they are expending funds appropriated for that purpose by others, then the degree of their generosity would be somewhat abated, and another inquiry would arise: what is the secret of this effort of propaganda? For that seems the proper word to define this extraordinary movement. We are at no loss to conjecture. At present, we content ourselves with merely stating the facts, as reported to us by respectable gentlemen.—Spartan.

PROVIDENCE, Rhode Island, April 3.—At the election for State officers and Congressmen yesterday Phil Allen (dem.) was elected Governor by 600 majority. George G. King (whig) and K. B. Thurston (dem.) were elected to Congress. Lieut. Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and State Treasurer, are all democrats. In the Senate 13 whigs and 14 democrats—no choice in four districts. In the House 25 whigs and 31 democrats—no choice in six districts. The present democratic majority on joint ballot is seven.—Memphis Appeal.

It is reported that two men were arrested in a neighboring county for stealing a door; they were caught when they went back to steal the house!—[Allentown Enterprise.]

We know them. They were sent to the Penitentiary; on Lake county some years ago, for stealing a saw mill. They were caught while attempting to carry away the dam.—Painesville Telegraph.

When a man starts to California he calls the country El Dorado. When he comes back he calls it Hell Dorado.